



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/954,724	09/12/2001	Sondre Skatter	101217.00033	8836
33649	7590	03/25/2009		
Mr. Christopher John Rourk Jackson Walker LLP 901 Main Street, Suite 6000 DALLAS, TX 75202			EXAMINER TANG, KAREN C	
			ART UNIT 2451	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/25/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/954,724

Applicant(s)

SKATTER ET AL.

Examiner

KAREN C. TANG

Art Unit

2451

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 12, 18, 19 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

- A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 08/08/2008 has been entered.
- Claims 1-23 are presented for further examination.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 6 is objected because it uses acronyms in the claim language without initially providing the complete term. For example, Claim 6 recites the limitation "PC" should be first introduced as "Personal Computer"

Claim 12 is objected because it uses acronyms in the claim language without initially providing the complete term. For example, Claim 12 recites the limitation "3D" should be first introduced as "Three Dimension"

Claim 18 is objected because it uses acronyms in the claim language without initially providing the complete term. For example, Claim 18 recites the limitation "URL" should be first introduced as "Universal Resource Locator"

Claim 19 is objected to because of the following informalities: The term “XL” might be a typographical error, and was intended to be “XML”.

Claim 19 is objected because it uses acronyms in the claim language without initially providing the complete term. For example, Claim 19 recites the limitation “XML” should be first introduced as “Extensible Markup Language”

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the method claims such as claim 1 does not appear to tied to a particular machine or apparatus or transforms a particular article to a different state or things. The method claims must meet a specialized, limited meaning to qualify as a patent-eligible process claim thus, since the method claims such as claim 1 has failed to qualify as a patent-eligible process claim, thus, the method claims 1-11 are not qualify as one of the categories of statutory subject matter.

Claims 12-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 101 because the system claims appear to consist only software modules, therefore, a system that contains only software modules is considered as a program per se, which is not one of the categories of statutory subject matter.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 18, 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claiming scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. Thus, the use of a trademark or trade name in a claim to identify or describe a material or product would not only render a claim indefinite, but would also constitute an improper use of the trademark or trade name.

For examining purposes, the Trademark or trade name is thus mooted.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 8-10, 12-17, 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barros (US 2004/0119759) in view of Besi et al hereinafter Besi (US 2003/0038798).

1. Referring to Claim 1. Barros discloses a method of presenting data over a network comprising: providing a persistent graphical object representing a rotating three dimensional model that depicts a plurality of geographical points and a plurality of geographical regions representative of geographical locations of a physical world (refer to par 0129 ); extracting a

plurality of content elements from at least one data file (refer to 0079), at least one of the content elements conveying information related to at least one geographical location of the physical world (refer to 0064); superimposing the at least one content element on the graphical object at the geographical point or geographical region that is representative of the geographical location of the physical world to which the content element relates (refer to par 0092 and 0093, 0102 and 0103); presenting said graphical object in a composition accessed by an initial application, said object having state and having one or more possible external connections (refer to 0107-0122); allowing a user to indicate relocation of said graphical object to a location outside of said initial application (refer to par 0122); and thereafter moving said graphical object to said outside location, preserving state of said graphical object (refer to 0123).

Although Barros disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Barros did not explicitly disclosing that “graphical object representing a rotating globe”

Besi, in analogous art, disclosing “a graphical object representing a rotating globe (refer to 0291)”

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Barros with Besi because Besi’s teaching of “graphical object representing a rotating globe” would improve Barros system by providing efficiency searching in the 3D data structure that allows user to visually retrieve the information of interest.

2. Referring to Claim 2. Barros and Besi disclosed the method according to claim 1. Barros further discloses that wherein said graphical object, once relocated, will persist and maintain state after termination of said initial application (annotate, refer to 0129).

3. Referring to Claim 3, Barros and Besi disclosed the method according to claim 1. Barros further discloses wherein said initial application location is a web browser and said new location is a desktop provided by an operating system (refer to 0076).
4. Referring to Claim 4, Barros and Besi disclosed the method according to claim 1. Barros further discloses wherein at least some of said content elements convey at least one of the following types of information: one or more images indicating weather in various locations (refer to par 0122); and one or more links indicating news stories related to a particular location displayed on said globe.
5. Referring to Claim 5, Barros and Besi disclosed the method according to claim 1. Barros further discloses wherein said relocation may be repeated from a current location to any number of additional platforms (refer to par 0066).
6. Referring to Claim 8, Barros and Besi disclosed the method according to claim 1. Barros further discloses wherein said graphical object comprises: one or more user interface components and wherein said components are preserved after a relocation (refer to par 0070 and par 0101); and one or more connections to one or more external entities and wherein said connections are preserved after a relocation (refer to 0085, 0101).

7. Referring to Claim 9. Barros and Besi disclosed the method according to claim 1. Barros discloses wherein said allowing a user to indicate relocation comprises selecting and dragging a graphical object (refer to par 0070).

8. Referring to Claim 10. Barros and Besi disclosed the method according to claim 1. Barros discloses wherein said allowing a user to indicate relocation comprises discontinuously selecting a graphical object and placing said object in a new location (refer to 0097 and 0098).

9. Referring to Claim 12. Barros discloses a system presenting web content comprising: an information appliance displayable representation of a rotating three dimensional model (refer to par 0129), where the globe is displayed using 3D software rendering and wherein the globe depicts a plurality of geographical points and a plurality of geographical regions representative of geographical locations of a physical world (refer to par 0129); a logic module that projects web content onto the surface of said representation of the three dimensional model (refer to par 0129):

wherein the logic module is configured to extract a plurality of content elements from at least one data file of a separate application, at least one of the content elements conveying information related to at least one geographical location of the physical world (refer to par 0064); and wherein the logic module is configured to superimpose the at least one content element on the three dimensional model at the geographical point or geographical region that is representative of the geographical location of the physical world to which the content element relate (refer to par 0092, 0093, and 0102 and 0103).



Although Barros disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Barros did not explicitly disclosing that “graphical object representing a rotating globe”

Besi, in analogous art, disclosing “a graphical object representing a rotating globe (refer to 0291)”

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Barros with Besi because Besi’s teaching of “graphical object representing a rotating globe” would improve Barros system by providing efficiency searching in the 3D data structure that allows user to visually retrieve the information of interest.

10. Referring to Claim 13. Barros and Besi disclosed a system according to claim 12. Barros discloses wherein said information appliance is configured to provide the representation of the three dimensional object through a web browser as embedded in a web page and can reside on an operating system desktop (refer to 0006, 0007).

Although Barros disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Barros did not explicitly disclosing that “graphical object representing a rotating globe”

Besi, in analogous art, disclosing “a graphical object representing a rotating globe (refer to 0291)”

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Barros with Besi because Besi’s teaching of “graphical object representing a rotating globe” would improve Barros system by providing efficiency searching in the 3D data structure that allows user to visually retrieve the information of interest.

11. Referring to Claim 14. Barros and Besi disclosed a system according to claim 12. Barros further discloses comprising means for rendering web content on the three dimensional object as channels, wherein a channel is a set of related content from a content provider, an association of content providers, or a broker of web content, and wherein a content item in a channel has a geographical distribution (refer to 0067).

Although Barros disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Barros did not explicitly disclosing that “graphical object representing a rotating globe”

Besi, in analogous art, disclosing “a graphical object representing a rotating globe (refer to 0291)”

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Barros with Besi because Besi’s teaching of “graphical object representing a rotating globe” would improve Barros system by providing efficiency searching in the 3D data structure that allows user to visually retrieve the information of interest.

12. Referring to Claim 15. Barros and Besi disclosed a system according to claim 14. Barros further discloses comprising means for associating the content item with points on said representation of the three dimensional object or regions on said representation of the three dimensional object (refer to par 0067).

Although Barros disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Barros did not explicitly disclosing that “graphical object representing a rotating globe”

Besi, in analogous art, disclosing “a graphical object representing a rotating globe (refer to 0291)”

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Barros with Besi because Besi's teaching of "graphical object representing a rotating globe" would improve Barros system by providing efficiency searching in the 3D data structure that allows user to visually retrieve the information of interest.

13. Referring to Claim 16. Barros and Besi disclosed a system according to claim 14. Barros further discloses means for providing a textual window that will pop up that reveals details about the content item when a cursor is moved over the content item (refer to par 0074 and 0078).

14. Referring to Claim 17. Barros and Besi disclosed a system according to claim 14. Barros further discloses means for associating the content item with actions that are triggered when a user selects the content item (refer to 0074).

15. Referring to Claim 20. Barros and Besi disclosed a system according to claim 19. Barros further discloses wherein channels reference Envooi sub-compositions configured to be added dynamically to a GlobeVoii application (refer to 0126).

16. Referring to Claim 21. A system according to claim 14 comprising means for licensing channels to channel providers on a pay per channel, pay per end user, or a pay per user action basis.

17. Referring to Claim 22. Barros and Besi disclosed a system according to claim 14. Barros further discloses wherein a texture map rendered on said representation of the three dimensional objec is part of a separate 2D rendering system, said 2D rendering system comprising a local display managing system for managing repainting damages (refer to 0075).

Claims 18, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barros (US 2004/0119759) in view of Besi et al hereinafter Besi (US 2003/0038798) in further view of Fu et al hereinafter Fu (US 6,647,370).

18. Referring to Claim 18. Barros and Besi disclosed a system according to claim 17. Barros further discloses wherein said actions are one or more selected from the group consisting of: opening a web browser with a URL link as a parameter (refer to 0014); bringing content to the globe with a parameter the web address of content (refer to 0093);

Although Barros and Besi disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Barros and Besi did not explicitly disclosing that “initiation of communication to another a GlobeVoii user through email, chat, or sending an instant message.”

Fu, in analogous art, disclosing “allowing user to initiation of communication to another a GlobeVoii user through email, chat, or sending an instant message (refer to Col 2, Lines 15-20)”

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Barros, Besi and Fu because Fu’s teaching of “initiation of communication to another a GlobeVoii user through email, chat, or sending an instant message” would improve

Barros and Besi's system by providing efficiency searching for the time zone across the Earth in order to keep up with appointments scheduled (refer to Fu, Col 2, Lines 15-45).

19. Referring to Claim 23. Barros and Besi disclosed a system according to claim 14. Although Barros and Besi disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Barros and Besi did not explicitly disclosing "wherein a representation of the globe is configured to display real time daylight illumination of Earth using 3D shading."

Fu, in analogous art, disclosing "wherein a representation of the globe is configured to display real time daylight illumination of Earth using 3D shading (refer to Col 5, Lines 5-20)"

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Barros, Besi and Fu because Fu's teaching of "wherein a representation of the globe is configured to display real time daylight illumination of Earth using 3D shading" would improve Barros and Besi's system by providing efficiency searching for the time zone across the Earth in order to keep up with appointments scheduled (refer to Fu, Col 2, Lines 15-45).

Claims 6, 7, 11 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barros (US 2004/0119759) in view of Besi et al hereinafter Besi (US 2003/0038798) in further view of Official Notice.

20. Referring to Claim 6, Barros and Besi disclosed the method according to claim 3. Barros further discloses wherein said desktop provided by an operating system is an interface of a platform, said platform is selected from a internet appliances (refer to 0068).

Although Barros and Besi disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Barros and Besi did not explicitly disclosing that said platform selected from the groups further consists of : a windows PC, a Macintosh PC, a Unix-type operating system, a set-top box, a wireless logic appliance, an internet appliance, a personal digital assistant, or another device connected to a network

Official Notice is taken that the platform are selected from a group consists of a windows PC, a Macintosh PC, a Unix-type operating system, a set-top box, a wireless logic appliance, an internet appliance, a personal digital assistant, or another device connected to a network because these platforms are well known platforms to the one of ordinary skill in the art and that it would have obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to implementing a system to provide all these known platforms for user to select.

21. Referring to Claim 7, Barros and Besi disclosed the method according to claim 1. Barros further discloses wherein said new location is selected from the group consisting of: a desktop provided by an operating system (refer to par 0070).

Although Barros and Besi disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Barros and Besi did not explicitly disclosing that the group further comprising "an application from the initial application, and a different computer platform with a different operating system"

Official Notice is taken that the platform are selected from a group consists of an application from the initial application, and a different computer platform with a different operating system because these instances are well known locations to the one of ordinary skill in the art and that it would have obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to implementing a system to provide all these known location from various platform for user to select.

22. Referring to Claim 11. Barros and Besi disclosed the method according to claim 8. Barros discloses wherein said one or more external entities are selected from web servers (refer to 0129).

Although Barros and Besi disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Barros and Besi did not explicitly disclosing that the external entities are further selected from the group consisting of "other applications, background processes, and other remote processes"

Official Notice is taken that the entities are selected from a group consists of other applications, background processes, and other remote processes because these entities are well known entities to the one of ordinary skill in the art and that it would have obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to implementing a system to provide all these known entities for user to select.

23. Referring to Claim 19. Barros and Besi disclosed a system according to claim 14. Barros further discloses comprising means for defining channels using a software language format describing at least in terms of geographic position, click-action, and parameters for click action (refer to 0122).

Although Barros and Besi disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Barros and Besi did not explicitly disclosing that a software language format is a XML format describing contents.

Official Notice is taken that a system can utilizing a XML format for implementing a software application because XML format content is well known in the art and it must be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to utilizing this particular type of software format to formulate the data content.

### ***Conclusion***

**Examiner's Notes:** Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner. In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.



Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karen C. Tang whose telephone number is (571)272-3116. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7 - 3.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571)272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Karen C Tang/

Examiner, Art Unit 2451